The Report Committee for Meghan Cordula Andrews
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following Report:

Appropriating Elizabeth: Absent Women in Shakespeare's *Henriad*

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor:

Wayne A. Rebhorn, Jr.

Douglas S. Bruster

Appropriating Elizabeth: Absent Women in Shakespeare's *Henriad*

by

Meghan Cordula Andrews, A.B.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2010

Dedication

For my parents and my sister.

Acknowledgements

This report has benefited from the guidance and aid of numerous people, and it is my pleasure to acknowledge them here. My readers, Wayne A. Rebhorn, Jr. and Douglas S. Bruster, gave generously of their time and attention. I am grateful for their sustained encouragement and critical acumen; this report would not have been possible without their guidance. I also wish to thank James Loehlin, Eric Mallin, Elizabeth Scala, and Marjorie Curry Woods, for allowing me to discuss this project with them at length. It has been much enriched by their suggestions. Thanks are also due to Jonathan P. Lamb and Rachel Wise, who read early drafts and helped me clarify exactly what it was I was attempting to argue. I am always indebted to Coppélia Kahn, who first revealed to me the possibilities of working with Shakespeare. Lastly, I am forever grateful to my parents, Stephen M. and Cathy Cunningham Andrews, and my sister, Sydney Elaine, for always believing in me, even and most especially when I myself cannot, and for their unwavering support.

May 2010

Abstract

Appropriating Elizabeth: Absent Women in Shakespeare's *Henriad*

Meghan Cordula Andrews, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2010

Supervisor: Wayne A. Rebhorn, Jr.

When scholars look for a Shakespearean analogue to Queen Elizabeth I, they often look no farther than his Richard II, the deposed and effeminate king with whom Elizabeth was known to compare herself. This report seeks to broaden our reading of Shakespeare's *Henriad* by arguing that, in fact, there are echoes of Elizabeth in both Henry IV and Henry V, successors to Richard II. These traces of Elizabeth reveal the *Henriad*'s fantasy of a male-dominated political sphere as just that: a fantasy. Moreover, this appropriation of maternal or effeminate characteristics is not limited to the *Henriad*'s rulers, but occurs several times in the Shakespearean canon. This absorption becomes another way for Shakespeare's plays to manage their anxiety over threatening women even as they appropriate the authority of an aging Elizabeth.

Table of Contents

APPROPRIATING ELIZABETH: ABSENT WOMEN IN SHAKESPEARE'S *HENRIAD*

Introduction

On February 7, 1601, the Lord Chamberlain's Men put on a special revival of Shakespeare's *Richard II*. Commissioned by followers of the Earl of Essex and performed on the eve of his rebellion, this performance has long served as a *locus classicus* for new historicist and cultural materialist criticism, taken as evidence of a close relationship between early modern politics and literature. Given the performance's obvious resonance with the Essex Rebellion, historicist criticism has often drawn a direct line between Elizabeth I and Richard II, and a similar line between Henry IV and Essex.[1]

[1] Scholars also point to Sir John Hayward's imprisonment in 1599 for dedicating his *History of Henry IV* to Essex, and the references to *Richard II* in Essex' trial for treason, as evidence of this link. See for example Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986), 268-76; Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Histories: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy* (San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1947), 170-212; or, for a recent treatment that displays the hold this performance still possesses on the critical mind, Paul E. J. Hammer, "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.1 (Spring 2008): 1-35. As an example of how important the Essex performance has become to criticism of *Richard II*, it is worth noting that that the first fifteen pages of the introduction to the most recent Arden *Richard II* are dedicated to the Elizabeth-as-Richard II reading; see *King Richard II*, ed. Charles Forker (London: Thomson Learning, 2002). The *Norton Shakespeare*, while including little material on Shakespeare's sources, reprints several short excerpts from early modern documents that also suggest the Richard II-Elizabeth link. See *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997). See also Forker, 5n1.

These links are only bolstered by several contemporary comments, the most famous of which is Elizabeth's apocryphal but oft-cited "I am Richard II. Know ye not that?"[2]

By contrast, a second vein of historicist criticism links Essex with Henry V. Pointing to the veiled references to Essex in *Henry V*'s fifth chorus as well as the Essex faction's own idolization of the king, these scholars seek to explore Shakespeare's motivations in casting Essex as Henry V. But the corollary of this reading—that if Essex is Henry V, we must see something of Elizabeth in Henry IV—has gone largely unexplored by scholars.[3] There is greater critical recognition of the fact that there is something of Elizabeth in Henry V, though critics have not necessarily investigated this parallel from a feminist or gender-oriented angle.

From this vantage point, it seems relevant that the *Henriad* depicts an aging, infirm monarch who worries incessantly over the succession. Written between 1595 and 1599, the *Henriad* was composed in the twilight years of Elizabeth's reign, when all of England was aware of her age and infirmity. Eric Mallin has demonstrated that this cultural knowledge is encoded in several other plays written by Shakespeare at the end of

---

[2] Quoted in John Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Elizabeth I*, 3 vols. (1823; New York: AMS Press, 1968), 3.552. For a survey (and criticism) of how the Essex *Richard II* performance has been utilized by historicist and materialist critics, see Leeds Barroll, "A New History for Shakespeare and His Time," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39.4 (Winter 1988): 441-64. Barroll posits that Hayward's imprisonment has been wrongly used to strengthen the association of Elizabeth with Richard amongst Shakespearean critics.

[3] David Scott Kastan merely suggests, but does not develop, this link between Henry IV and Elizabeth in "'The King Hath Many Marching in His Coats,' or, What Did You Do in the War, Daddy?" in *Shakespeare Left and Right*, ed. Ivo Kamps (New York:

Elizabeth's reign.[4] This essay seeks to read the *Henriad* in the same light, as a response to her decline, which allows for a masculine absorption of Elizabeth that perhaps could not have occurred earlier in her reign. That there are few female characters in the *Henriad* is generally taken as backlash against female rule. Graham Holderness points out that especially with regards to gender, the history plays "reflect the dominant ideology, rather than any historical actuality, of late Tudor society"; Phyllis Rackin similarly argues that women in Elizabethan England had "more authority than patriarchal ideology could accommodate," and that the myth of patriarchy "was not so much a description of as a response to the conditions of actual Elizabethan life," reflecting anxiety over female power.[5] Since the most dominant woman in Elizabethan England was Elizabeth herself, it seems inevitable that these history plays would respond to her reign with fantasies of a male-dominated political sphere. As Holderness and Rackin suggest, this response seems on the surface largely negative, evincing a desire to remove Elizabeth from history. But even as these plays present fantasies of a male-dominated political sphere, they also evidence the impossibility of truly banishing Elizabeth from the text. For we can see echoes of Elizabeth in both Henry IV and Henry V, especially in terms of their gender

---

Routledge, 1991): 241-58, esp. 241. See also Campbell 229-44 for echoes of the Northern Rebellion in *1 Henry IV*.

4 See Eric Mallin, *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995). In his chapter on *Troilus and Cressida*, Mallin posits emulation as a key feature of the play; we can see the theme of emulation being deployed (and undermined) throughout the *Henriad*, for example in the relationships between Hal and Hotspur and Hal and the Dauphin.

coding; in particular, Henry V utilizes very Elizabethan strategies for ruling. It is the implications of these echoes of the Queen in the *Henriad* that this essay seeks to address.

---

5 Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare: The Histories* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000), 39; Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990), 191-92.

I

1 Henry IV was Shakespeare's most popular printed play, with nine editions published before 1640.[6] It was especially popular close to its initial performance run at the close of Elizabeth's reign: two editions were printed in 1598, a third in 1599, and a fourth in 1604, while the remaining five editions were sprinkled between 1608 and 1639. But while much of its enduring popularity has traditionally been ascribed to Falstaff, such an explanation fails to explain why Falstaff's two other plays did not attain the same level of commercial success in Elizabethan and early Jacobean England. The other plays in which Falstaff appears—*2 Henry IV* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*—seemed relatively *un*popular at the turn of the century. *2 Henry IV*'s only quarto came in 1600, and while *Merry Wives* was issued in three editions, the first came in 1602 but the next was delayed until the Pavier quarto of 1619. In contrast, Shakespeare's most popular play after *1 Henry IV* was *Richard III*, with eight editions (four coming between 1597 and 1605), followed by *Richard II* (six editions, one in 1597 and two in 1598). *The First Part of the Contention* also saw its second edition in 1600 (first in 1594), as did *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* (first in 1595). *Henry V* had two editions, in 1600 and

---

6 All publication statistics are taken from A. W. Pollard et al., eds., *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (London: The Bibliographic Society, 1976). The statistics given refer only to discrete play quartos or octavos; editions of the plays in collections (i.e., in the Folios) are not counted. "Popular" is used here with the obvious caveat that we do not know how well any given edition sold; nevertheless, I assume that

1602, making it more successful than *2 Henry IV* and *Merry Wives* in the late Elizabethan-early Jacobean transition period (though it still lagged behind *Richard II*). In comparison, the only other Shakespeare play to see multiple editions in this span was *Romeo and Juliet*, printed in 1597 and 1599. It thus appears that although the character of Falstaff, and the humors comedy in general, enjoyed a certain popularity at the turn of the century, neither was as commercially successful or as in demand as the deposition histories. My assertion is that the frequent printing of the deposition histories was responding to a demand; it spoke to a London populace anxious over the unsettled succession, a populace that saw echoes of its own situation dramatized in the texts.

It is also worth noting that in Shakespeare's *oeuvre* the *Henriad* (composed 1595-99) is surrounded by plays that also reflect a concern over the end of Elizabeth's reign, suggesting that we should read the *Henriad* as similarly contextualized. Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* (1596-97), *As You Like It* (1599), and *Twelfth Night* (1601) contain cross-dressing heroines whom Leah S. Marcus has suggested are responses to and reflections of Elizabeth.[7] Also composed around the time of the *Henriad* were *Julius Caesar* (1599), detailing the murder of a "king" and the subsequent transfer of power, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595-96), suggestive both in its subplot—in which an

---

for so many editions to be published in such a short time, there was—or at least publishers felt there was—a large demand for them among consumers.

[7] Here I follow the dates given in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al., 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997). Unless otherwise noted, all Shakespeare quotations and citations reference this edition. See Leah S. Marcus, *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 96-105. For clarity's sake, I will refer to Hal/Prince Harry/Henry V as Hal

unruly queen is brought under her husband's control—and in its depiction of the relationship between Theseus and Hippolyta.[8] Moreover, immediately following *Henry V* came *Hamlet* (1600-01) and *Troilus and Cressida* (1601-02), two plays that (along with *Twelfth Night*) Mallin has shown as deeply respondent to the end of Elizabeth's reign (and, in *Hamlet*'s case, also concerned with an unsettled succession). In arguing for the *Henriad* as shaped by the end of Elizabethan England, I neither take it as a tightly constructed monolith, as Tillyard would have it, nor do I consider it entirely discontinuous. Instead I read it as a series of plays that are inflected by their cultural moment in a similar manner and that form a loose cycle, insofar as they all—as plays, playtexts, and commodities—were required to be intelligible in isolation.

When the Hostess tells Hal that there is a nobleman from the court waiting to speak with him and bearing a message from Henry, Hal tells her to "[g]ive him as much as will make him a royal man, and send him back again to my mother" (*1H4* 2.4.290-91). Editors since have tended to assume that Hal is referring to his late mother with this line; the *Riverside* gloss, for example, reads, "i.e. get rid of him permanently. The Prince's mother, Mary de Bohun, had died in 1394" (2.4.291n).[9] That Hal is in fact referring

---

and Bolingbroke/Henry IV as either Bolingbroke or Henry throughout the remainder of this essay; where "Henry V" is used it is in reference to the historical man.

[8] For *Julius Caesar* as also reflective of the end of the Elizabethan era, see Wayne A. Rebhorn, "The Crisis of the Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43.1 (Spring 1990): 75-111. For *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and Elizabeth, see Louis A. Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 109-205.

[9] Kastan notes that "this is the only mention of Hal's mother in the play. Hal's mother, Mary Bohun, was the first wife of Henry IV; after her death, however, the king

pejoratively to his father in this moment—referring to his father as his mother—is an interpretation that, to my knowledge, no critic has put forth. Many readings of the *Henriad* argue that Hal either has two father figures or a father and mother figure in Henry and Falstaff, and that Hal rejects and banishes Falstaff (either the rival father or the mother) in order to reunite with Henry, assume his proper place at court, succeed his father, and thereby establish proper masculine identity and patriarchal control. This reading casts Henry both as a powerful king in a patriarchal society and a strong paternal figure.[10] Although this critical paradigm has much to recommend it, it forecloses the possibility that Hal sees something maternal or perhaps even effeminate in Henry. What I propose here is that we think in precisely those terms.

In *Richard II*, Henry Bolingbroke is a comparatively hyper-masculine figure, but that version of Henry does not reappear in the plays named for him. In fact, even in *Richard II*, there are hints of Henry's future weakness. Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin note that although Henry's "theatrical power is described, it is never shown," and

---

married Joan of Navarre, daughter of Charles the Bad, and it is perhaps of his stepmother that Hal is thinking here, though the witticism is surely the main point." See *King Henry IV Part 1*, ed. Kastan (London: Thomson Learning, 2002), 2.4.282n. Valerie Traub interprets the line as referring to Mary Bohun and uses this line to argue that "death holds specifically maternal associations" for Hal and Henry. See her *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 59.

10 See, for example, Coppélia Kahn, *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), ch. 3; Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays,* Hamlet *to* The Tempest (New York: Routledge, 1992), 11-12; and Peter Erickson, *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), ch. 2.

that he is a curiously uncharismatic presence throughout *Richard II*.[11] At the end of the play, when Henry bemoans his wayward son, "the entire scene…naturaliz[es] Henry's lack of patriarchal authority in the image of the troubled family that will be a *leitmotif* in both parts of *Henry IV*" (Howard and Rackin 155). Henry perhaps inaugurates his own unmanning when he deposes Richard, violating the feudal obligations that govern their relationship, obligations whose fulfillment contributed to man's masculine identity. Moreover, Henry lacks visible success in his military endeavors—as with his theatrical power, while critics tend to give Henry credit for being a "master of military strategy" (Howard and Rackin 142), this is never made apparent to the audience. Henry's duel with Mowbray is pre-empted by Richard; Henry does not resort to violence during the deposition; and he is actually defeated at Shrewsbury and must be rescued by Hal in *1 Henry IV*. The aggregate effect presents Henry as a monarch whose masculinity is more honored in the breach than the audience's observance.

Henry looks particularly unmanly when he refuses to let Hal face Hotspur in single combat, and then sends several of his men into battle dressed as himself. Jennifer Low argues that the early modern duel represented "a nexus for several different notions of masculinity…. [It] embodied a masculine code that shored up the faltering sense of masculinity among young male aristocrats," by providing a rite of passage that would

---

11 Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 152.

thrust the victor into full manhood.[12] Hal does, of course, duel with and defeat Hotspur, but Henry's rejection of this masculine rite can be interpreted as effeminizing him. Henry's multiplication of himself via his battlefield body doubles also suggests what Patricia Parker identifies as *copia*, uncontrolled reproduction associated with the feminine.[13]

Notable also is that Henry's failure as a warrior is a change that Shakespeare consciously made to the narrative provided in Holinshed's *Chronicles*. According to Holinshed, the king "broke the array of his enemies" at Shrewsbury and "did that day many a noble feat of arms, for (as it is written) he slew that day with his own hands six and thirty persons of his enemies."[14] In Holinshed, Henry is also the one who magnanimously frees the Douglas after the battle is over, not Hal; similarly, in Holinshed Hal does not offer to fight Hotspur in single combat (Kastan notes that the incident is actually transplanted from a later clash between Hal and the Duke of Orleans, 5.1.99n), nor does he kill Hotspur. These deviations from Holinshed focus the action on Hal; in so doing, however, Shakespeare's changes effeminize Henry. Shakespeare also ages Henry.

---

12 Jennifer Low, *Manhood and the Duel: Masculinity in Early Modern Drama and Culture* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 3, 5, and ch. 3. Low also notes that being defeated was emasculating, which suggests that Henry's manliness is further weakened when he loses to the Douglas. Here I define "emasculating" as roughly synonymous with effeminate and effeminized; all three terms indicate a man who possesses gender traits normatively coded as feminine in early modern England.

13 Patricia Parker, *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, Property* (New York: Methuen, 1985), ch. 2. Henry's multiplication of himself in order to trick the rebels is perhaps an extreme rejection of the duel, as it makes a mockery of one-on-one combat.

14 Raphael Holinshed, *Shakespeare's Holinshed: An Edition of Holinshed's* Chronicles *(1587)*, ed. Richard Hosley (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968), 106.

Many critics have noted that Shakespeare portrays him as being much older than he was historically, perhaps closer to Elizabeth in years, suggesting a further parallel between Shakespeare's Henry and Elizabeth.

In *1 Henry IV*, there are also several parallels drawn between Henry and the effeminate Richard. Close to the beginning of the play, Henry proclaims that "I will from henceforth rather be myself," acknowledging that he has failed at being a (fully masculine) king prior to this moment (*1H4* 1.3.5). A variation of this sentiment is voiced no less than five times in *Richard II*, each time connected to Richard's weakness and effeminacy.[15] The language of pilgrimage surrounds both the deposed Richard and the guilt-ridden Henry in another Shakespearean departure from Holinshed, as Holinshed's Henry only desires to go to Jerusalem in the last year of his life. And in Act 3, Scene 1 of *2 Henry IV*, Richard Abrams observes that Henry "becomes a dramatically effectual version of Richard II in prison," as Henry has faced many of the same challenges that plagued Richard, and has had a similar response to them.[16] While Henry's dramatic

---

15 While arguing for Bolingbroke to be given Lancaster and his patrimony, York argues "Be not thyself; for how art thou a king/But by fair sequence and succession?" (2.1.198-99); rationalizing rebellion, Northumberland reasons that "The King is not himself" (2.1.241); embracing treason, Northumberland says that Henry will "make high majesty look like itself," implying that Richard does not (2.1.295); attempting to regain control of his emotions and simultaneously conquer his fear of deposition, Richard says "I had forgot myself" (3.2.83); of a deposed Richard, his Queen says that he is "King Richard's tomb,/And not King Richard" (5.1.12-13). The sentiment takes on a particularly gendered tone when, after Henry in *1 Henry IV* chastises Hal for his "wanton and effeminate" behavior (*R2* 5.3.10), Hal claims that he will "[b]e more myself" (*1H4* 3.2.93).

16 Richard Abrams, "Rumor's Reign in *2 Henry IV*: The Scope of a Personification," *English Literary Renaissance* 16.3 (September 1986): 467-95, 480.

effectiveness is debatable, his scenes in *2 Henry IV* do possess a Ricardian flavor. These echoes of Richard in Henry forge a thematic connection between the two and suggest effeminacy in *1 Henry IV*'s Henry.

Moreover, both Richard and Henry associate their kingdoms with the maternal. Richard does so explicitly in *Richard II* (see for example 1.3.123-43 and 3.2.4-26); he "identifies his sovereignty with a maternal realm," acts as "both mother and nurse," and "claims a maternal relation to the kingdom, thus confessing to a relationship of…weakness" (Holderness, *The Histories* 184, 193). Pointing out that *1 Henry IV* similarly "begins in a mood of revulsion against war, militarism, even masculinity," Holderness argues that Henry attempts

> not simply to unite the nation as a means of averting civil war, but to renew the heroic tradition by synthesizing war and peace, male and female…. [He also attempts to] acknowledge the interdependence of male aggression and female creativity, feminine 'weakness' (as exemplified by Christ) and masculine force. The crusaders would thus be formed in the image of the heroic father and the creative mother…drawn together by a common maternal origin. (157-58)

Holderness comes close to suggesting that Henry acts as a mother, or at least uses maternal imagery as a monarchical tool, but argues that Henry fails in his attempt to unite the masculine and feminine, and drops the connection soon after. However, upon examination, the suggestion that Henry acts in an effeminate manner seems undeniable.

Much scholarship imagines masculinity and femininity as binary opposites, so that if Bolingbroke is figured as the masculine alternative to Richard's effeminacy in *Richard II*, then he must be consistently opposed to effeminacy throughout the tetralogy. But such as binary is false. As scholars such as Judith Butler have argued, masculinity

and femininity exist on a continuum. It is possible for Henry to be at once more masculine than Richard and less so than his son, and it is possible for his position on the continuum to shift over time. The Henry of *Richard II* does not have to be the same Henry of *1* and *2 Henry IV*, and indeed, I argue that he is not.[17]

In *1 Henry IV*, Henry first appears "shaken" and "wan with care," by his own admission (*1H4* 1.1.1). In his later audience with Hotspur, Northumberland, and Worcester, his continues this self-description:

> My blood hath been too cold and temperate,
> Unapt to stir at these indignities,
> And you have found me, for accordingly
> You tread upon my patience; but be sure
> I will from henceforth rather be myself,
> Mighty and to be fear'd, than my condition,
> Which hath been smooth as oil, soft as young down,
> And therefore lost that title of respect
> Which the proud soul ne'er pays but to the proud. (*1H4* 1.3.1-9)

In the humoral model of the early modern body, women were imagined as the cold sex, men the hot. In detailing his coldness, his smoothness, and his softness, Henry inadvertently describes himself as womanish, while admitting that he has been unkingly—unmanly—recently. (Henry is elsewhere described as cold when Falstaff, talking about Hal, remarks on the "cold blood he did naturally inherit of his father," *2H4* 4.3.118.) Reading *1 Henry IV* through the humors, Bruce R. Smith comes to the

---

17 A continuum is an especially useful image here given that early modern medical theory subscribed to a one-sex model. See for example Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993), 16-17.

conclusion that Falstaff is phlegm and Hotspur choler.[18] If this humoral reading were continued, Hal would likely be cast as blood and Henry melancholy, one of the feminine humors, because of his professed coldness, his brooding, and his general temperament.[19]

Other characters perceive this weakness in Henry. Hotspur's attack on the effeminate court popinjay is aimed in part at Henry, perhaps indicative of how Hotspur views Henry—like the courtier, as a "waiting-gentlewoman" (1.3.55). But while Henry vows that he will "from henceforth rather be myself" at the beginning of *1 Henry IV*, there is little evidence that he succeeds. Although he strongly chastises Hal for his son's

---

[18] Bruce R. Smith, *Shakespeare and Masculinity* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000), 22. Paster has noted that Falstaff is female-seeming in part due to contemporary humoral theory, which held that men became more melancholic as they aged, becoming cold and dry like women. Given Shakespeare's emphasis on Henry's age, his humors can presumably be said to resemble Falstaff's, moving him toward androgyny. Interestingly, as Elizabeth aged, she used masculine referents for herself more and more frequently, also moving her toward a more androgynous place (Marcus 57-58). See Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 138-41.

[19] For a more in-depth discussion of melancholy and masculinity, see Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996), ch. 1, or Lynn Enterline, *The Tears of Narcissus: Melancholia and Masculinity in Early Modern Writing* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995). Breitenberg reads melancholy "as a repository for those elements deemed contrary to a specifically masculine vision of social order and individual rationality," and argues that "the melancholy man is characterized by his feminine qualities" (38, 54). Hal as "blood" works to assert his masculinity: "if perfect temperament is not achievable, then second best is for blood to dominate the other humors. Indeed, blood is the humor that makes men *men*" (B. Smith 20). Similarly, Breitenberg identifies blood as "the central figure for…the most significant trope[s] of masculinity" (49). Although *1 Henry IV* is certainly not a humors comedy in the same vein as Jonson's *Every Man In His Humor*, that the tavern characters are humors comedy characters perhaps leads the reader in the direction of a humoral reading.

wayward behavior in Act 3, Scene 2, he cannot maintain his stern façade throughout his speech:

> Not an eye
> But is a-weary of thy common sight,
> Save mine, which hath desir'd to see thee more,
> Which now doth that I would not have it do,
> Make blind itself with foolish tenderness. (*1H4* 3.2.87-91)[20]

Weeping, indicative of a permeable and perhaps seeping body, is a womanly action and is noted as such throughout the tetralogy. The Duchess of Gloucester and the Queen weep, as does the effeminate Richard; when recounting York's and Suffolk's deaths, Exeter says that the sight "forc'd/Those waters from me which I would have stopp'd,/But I had not so much of man in me,/And all my mother came into mine eyes/And gave me up to tears" (*H5* 4.6.28-32). In addition to weeping, that Henry appears to be overwhelmed by emotion also figures him as effeminate, as lack of self-control was a trait commonly ascribed to early modern women, in contrast to masculine self-discipline.[21]

With an eye to Henry's deficient masculinity, let us return to Hal's comment in Act 2, Scene 4 of *1 Henry IV*. As previously discussed, moderns editors have taken Hal's "[g]ive him as much as will make him a royal man, and send him back again to my mother," and glossed it as his telling the messenger to go away and never return (*1H4*,

---

20 The *Riverside* glosses "foolish tenderness" as tears, as does Kastan (see 3.2.91n in both); the editors of the *Norton* insert stage directions calling for Henry to weep after this line (3.2.91sd).

21 Jennifer C. Vaught argues for Richard as empowered through his tears and excessive emotionality, but places Richard in the private sphere when this happens, while Henry is still very much in the public sphere; see her *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008), ch. 4.

2.4.290-91). But if we view Henry IV as effeminate throughout the play, this line takes on a new valence because it is indicative of Hal's view of his father as effeminate. The full exchange reads

> *Host*. Marry, my lord, there is a nobleman of the court at door would speak with you. He says he comes from your father.
> *Prince* Give him as much as will make him a royal man, and send him back again to my mother. (*1H4*, 287-91)

Without discounting the aesthetic symmetry of father followed by mother, "back again" suggests that the messenger is returning to the figure that sent him. If so, the messenger must be returning to Henry, suggesting that Hal imagines his father, at least partially, as a maternal figure. Hal and Falstaff's later playacting of the audience between Hal and his father also suggests Henry's effeminacy. Preparing to act as Henry, Falstaff directs Hal to "[g]ive me a cup of sack to make my eyes look red, that it may be thought I have wept, for I must speak in passion" (*1H4* 2.4.384-86). That Falstaff wishes to speak weeping and "in passion," emotionally, is another suggestion of Henry's "effeminate" lack of emotional discipline. Finally, it is noteworthy that Henry's wife, Joan of Navarre, is a non-presence throughout the tetralogy. With Joan excised from the text, we are not given the opportunity to view Henry as a husband, denying him another possible venue in which he might demonstrate his masculinity.

II

Critics have long noted Elizabeth's appropriation of masculine language and prerogative to create a doubly-gendered identity for herself as a ruler. Her famous speech at Tilbury (whose attribution has also been questioned) is but the most famous of these self-fashionings: "I know I have the body but of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a king of England too."[22] Critics have long documented Elizabeth's disruption of normative gender identification via her reliance on the doctrine of the king's two bodies to gender her authority as masculine. Among literary scholars, Marcus details several of Elizabeth's strategies for doing so, including (but not limited to) her usage of the male term prince to refer to herself (and, as her reign wore on, her increasing use of king instead of prince); her figuration in the public imagination as a host of male mythological personalities (including St. George); her strong public identification with her father; and, later in life, her escalating references to

---

[22] Quoted in George P. Rice, *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth I* (New York: Columbia UP, 1951), 96. Though the accuracy of stories about Elizabeth at Tilbury has been challenged by recent scholarship (see Susan Frye, "The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23.1 [Spring 1992]: 95-114), the veracity of the stories is not as important as the fact of their existence. If fabricated, they become even more indicative of the popular image of Elizabeth. Portraiture of Elizabeth in armor was largely an invention of James' reign, intended as a rebuke to his own effeminacy, but Marcus notes that Elizabeth consciously censored such depictions in an attempt to contain anxiety over her doubly-gendered representation (62-66). For a broad overview of Elizabeth's place in Tudor culture, see Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), esp. chs. 1-4, 9-11, and 15-18. Montrose does note that regardless of the specifics of the real Tilbury speech, Elizabeth fortified "the hearts and stomachs of the weakest Englishmen with her *mascula vis*" (151); *mascula vis* is used in a Latin epigram on Elizabeth that appears in Camden's *Remains Concerning Britain* (284n20).

herself as the realm's husband (instead of wife, which she had used through most of her reign [Marcus 53-66]).[23] In fact, Elizabeth joked about being a man from time to time, and Marcus notes that there were even moments in which there was "rife covert speculation as to what the queen's precise gender was" (58). Her doubly-gendered persona was reflected in the popular imagination in works such as James Aske's *Elizabetha Triumphans* (1588), where she is referred to as a king and compared to Mars, and Henry Wotton's *State of Christendom* (1593/94), in which she is compared to Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, and Pompey. At the same time, Elizabeth used her sex to her advantage, fashioning a court of Petrarchan lovers around herself, creating the cult of the Virgin Queen, and later in life portraying herself as the mother to all her subjects. Thus, I argue that Henry's doubly-gendered persona as an effeminate man in *1 Henry IV* recalls Elizabeth's doubly-gendered self-fashionings, as does Henry's obvious grasp of political spectacle and pageantry, two things Elizabeth was also quite adept at utilizing.

By 1596, the probable composition date of *1 Henry IV*, Elizabeth's control over her court was unraveling, as the pillars of her state—men such as Walsingham and Leicester—were dying. Her relationship with her former favorite Essex had begun to fray

---

[23] See also Marie Axton, *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977); Carole Levin, *"The Heart and Stomach of a King": Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), chs. 1 and 6-7; and Holderness, *The Histories* 34-36. Frye argues that Elizabeth was not necessarily "a woman who identified only with what her society tended to define as masculine, or as a primarily androgynous figure—although to serve her purposes, she was at times coy, misogynistic, and androgynous. I contend that by using every representational strategy available, she carved out—or *engendered*—a conceptual space from which she could govern" (viii); see her *Elizabeth*

irrevocably, degenerating even as the *Henriad* was being composed. Hotspur perhaps recalls Essex in his "dashing demeanor…restless self-promotion…aura of glory…and his aggressive militarism" (Mallin 27-31), not to mention his rebellious, troubled relationship with a monarch who had once favored him. Anthony Esler identifies different codes of honor as illustrative of the generational gap between the older and younger Elizabethans, with the younger, such as Essex, valuing honor much in the same way Hotspur does.[24] (One suspects that Henry and Hal tend to side with Falstaff in his cynical attitude toward honor, aligning them with Elizabeth's generation and opposed to the romantic views of Hotspur and Essex.) We can see the reflection of the erosion of Elizabeth's control over her court in the factionalism under Henry and the bickering amongst the rebels in *1 Henry IV*. Though a *roman à clef* reading is untenable, *1 Henry IV* in a more general sense reflects several contemporary concerns about the aging and infirm monarch and her court, which seemed to be ripping itself apart.[25] Thus it is easy to see the allure of Hal for early modern playgoers. Standing in stark contrast to his father, Hal appears as what late Elizabethan culture desired: a strong male heir to succeed the aged, effeminate monarch,

---

I: The Competition for Representation (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993), esp. the introduction and ch. 1.

24 Anthony Esler, *The Aspiring Mind of the Elizabethan Younger Generation* (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1966).

25 Interestingly, there survives an anonymous commonplace book from Elizabethan England that contains scenes from *Henry IV*; however, the writer changed "king" to "queene" in each quotation. Quoted in Levin, 146 and 207n62; the commonplace book is recorded in the Sotheby Catalogue *English Literature and History: Comprising Printed Books, Autobiography Letters and Manuscripts* (the "Hotspur" catalogue).

capable of uniting the realm and ruling effectively, having rejected his "wanton and effeminate" ways (*R2* 5.3.10).

If Henry is effeminized in the *Henriad*, so is Hal's other "father," Falstaff. Falstaff's womanly side has been well discussed by critics, many of whom interpret the last scene of *2 Henry IV* as Hal turning away from the maternal and rejecting Falstaff's feminine influence.[26] In making this argument, critics point to his references to his stomach as a womb (*2H4* 4.3.22) and himself as a sow (*2H4* 1.2.8); his physical size (which Parker links to *copia*, dilation, *Fat Ladies* 20-23); and his "contempt for military valor, his incompetence on the battlefield, his inconstancy, his lies…and his sensual self-indulgence" (Howard and Rackin 166). And, lest we forget, in *Merry Wives* Falstaff appears in drag. Thus the banishment of the womanly Falstaff at the end of *2 Henry IV*, coupled with Henry's death, would seem to banish the maternal from the *Henriad*.[27]

2 Henry IV is also a play about the changing of the generational guard. Alison Thorne has observed that there is a "generational imbalance" in the play, as "[f]igures 'blasted with antiquity'—Falstaff, Bolingbroke, Northumberland, the Lord Chief Justice, Mistress Quickly, Justices Shallow and Silence—monopolise the scene, while youth, in the person

---

26 In addition to Kahn, Adelman (*Suffocating Mothers*), and Erickson, see Parker, *Fat Ladies* 21-22, and Traub ch. 2.

27 Falstaff also threatens Hal's masculinity as a homoerotic presence, for in a pederastic pedagogical relationship between them Hal would be the boy, the "feminine" partner. See Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992), ch. 5, or Rebhorn, *The Emperor of Men's Minds: Literature and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995), 144-47, 191-94.

of Hal especially, is forced to bide its time."[28] This situation must have resonated with an Elizabethan younger generation, whether aristocratic or common, which was biding its own time until Elizabeth and her ministers would pass away. That the end of *2 Henry IV* celebrates Hal's ascension would seem to put Elizabeth prematurely in her grave; but Hal's coronation procession recalls Elizabeth's processions,[29] and the epilogue tells the audience that he kneels to "pray for the Queen" (Ep.17)—which, along with the fifth chorus in *Henry V*, is the only explicit reference to Elizabeth in the histories. Thus even as *1* and *2 Henry IV* seem to play out a fantasy of a political sphere that buries Elizabeth, we can see that there are ways in which she lives on.

---

28 Alison Thorne, "There is a history in all men's lives: reinventing history in *2 Henry IV*," in *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*, ed. Dermont Cavanagh, Stuart Hampton-Reeves, and Stephen Longstaffe (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006): 49-66, 54.

29 C. E. McGee, "*2 Henry IV*: The Last Tudor Royal Entry," *Mirror up to Shakespeare: Essays in Honour of G. R. Hibbard*, ed. J. C. Gray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984): 149-58. See also Anny Crunelle-Vanrigh, "*Henry V* as a Royal Entry," *SEL* 47.2 (Spring 2007): 355-77, in which she argues that *Henry V*'s five choruses are structurally indebted to Elizabeth's coronation procession.

III

If *1* and *2 Henry IV* encode how Elizabethan society longed for a Hal, a fully masculine king, *Henry V* would seem to be the fulfillment of that desire. Hal, no longer the "wanton and effeminate boy" of the tavern (*R2* 5.3.10), is militarily successful, prosecutes his rebellious nobles, threatens Harfleur in language that emphasizes English virility, conquers the effeminate French, forms strong but proper homosocial bonds, and wins Katherine. Thus Hal in *Henry V* seems to be the answer to the country's prayers for a strong male monarch who does not suffer from sexual ambivalence.

But even as the *Henriad* was written, early modern culture's own understanding of what it meant to be a man was shifting. The militant Elizabethan courtiers of the 1580s and 1590s, their high ambitions stifled by Elizabeth's caution and distaste for military involvement (a limitation they felt attributable at least partially to her gender), felt emasculated by the queen's control. As a result, they worried about their own masculinity. Jennifer C. Vaught notes that there existed

> anxieties about the refashioning of aristocratic values during the reign of Elizabeth I. The male aristocracy was no longer defined by military service but rather by courtly display, including dress, gestures, and emotionally moving rhetoric…. [M]any…perceived Italianate dress and humanistic customs…as contributing to the threatening modernization (and effeminization) of English definitions of manhood. (91)[30]

---

[30] See also Howard and Rackin, 143-48; Low, 20-28; Esler, 78, 138-39 (and 105-08 for a broader view of the impact of Italianate culture on the Elizabethan younger generation); Holderness, *The Histories* ch. 1; Richard Halpern, *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991), esp. 244-46; and David Kuchta, "The Semiotics of Masculinity in Renaissance England," in *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe: Institutions, Texts, Images*, ed. James Grantham Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993): 233-46.

These shifting norms worked against the brand of martial masculinity espoused by Essex and his faction. English culture was itself aware of this sea change; Thomas Nashe, for example, pointed to the history plays as "a [sharp] reproof to these degenerate effeminate days of ours," singling out Henry V as "glorious" and deserving of "the right of fame that is due to true nobility deceased."[31] Jonathan Goldberg suggests that both Hotspur (the representative of the old chivalry) and Hal (ostensibly the masculine cure to Henry's effeminacy) treat this new breed of courtiers as if they are women (149).

As Vaught notes above, part of this shift included the courtier's development of his rhetorical skill. Wayne A. Rebhorn notes that there was considerable anxiety about the gender-coding of political rhetoric.[32] Rhetoric was a discipline vulnerable to charges of effeminacy, and rhetoricians felt the need to defend themselves against this charge (ultimately unsuccessfully). Shakespeare's histories evince this same anxiety over rhetoric. For example, Hotspur accuses Henry's perfumed envoy, petrified of battle, as using "holiday and lady terms" and speaking "like a waiting-gentlewoman" (*1H4* 1.3.46, 55); Mowbray identifies "[t]he bitter clamor of two eager tongues" as the "trial of a

---

Esler notes that melancholy, Henry's signal humor and a feminine humor, became a fashionable mood for this new breed of courtier (232).

31 Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penniless his Supplication to the Devil*, in *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*, ed. J. B. Steane (New York: Penguin, 1972), 113.

32 Rebhorn, *Emperor* ch. 3. See also Parker, *Fat Ladies* ch. 2, and her "Virile Style," in *Premodern Sexualities*, ed. Louise Fradenburg and Carla Freccero (New York: Routledge, 1996): 199-222.

woman's war" (*R2* 1.1.49, 48). Parker notes that late Elizabethan culture was self-conscious about the issue:

> The shift of style between sixteenth and early seventeenth-century England was also associated with the shifting of the monarch's gender. John Hoskins spoke of Elizabeth's 'copious style'…. Already in the sixteenth century the figure of the effeminate courtier or wordy popinjay…appeared on the English stage…linked to an excessive indulgence in words. ("Virile Style" 206)[33]

Accordingly, to save their rhetoric, men made a distinction between a "masculine" style, thought to be lean and sinewy, concise and unadorned, and "feminine" fleshy copiousness. Nevertheless, as an eloquent speaker, Hal too seems effeminized by the language he uses, for his language is as copious as the language derided above. After all, as Canterbury says, Hal speaks in "sweet and honeyed sentences," which charm men's ears and even the air itself (*H5* 1.1.50); Canterbury emphasizes the beauty of Hal's moving speeches. Hal's speeches in *Henry V* are also consistently long. Adjectives such as "concise" and "unadorned" do not accurately describe them. Thus it seems fair to say that Hal possesses a copious, womanly style, akin to the manner in which Elizabeth's is described and somewhat at odds with the extreme masculinization of his speeches. But we can read the sexualized violence explicit in his Harfleur speech and implicit in his words to Katherine as overdetermined attempts to compensate, an overdetermination that signals Hal's unconscious anxiety over his linguistic effeminacy.

---

[33] See in addition her *Fat Ladies* 21-24. Parker notes the early modern connection drawn between homosexuality and effeminate rhetoric ("Virile Style" 207). Aside from the relationship between Falstaff and Hal, at least one critic has read Hal as having a homosexual relationship with Scrope: see Richard Corum, "Henry's Desires," in Fradenburg and Frecerro, eds.: 71-97.

In Hal's rhetorical mastery, he recalls Richard more than Henry, even though Richard is usually taken as less manly because he is more suited to making speeches than to fighting in battle. Yet of the three kings, Hal has most mastered the skill set of the effeminate Italianate courtier.[34] But while Vaught argues that "Hal's rhetorical powers of negotiation and empathy function as key aspects of his manhood…diverg[ing] from prior feudal, militaristic generations of men who scorned the replacing of the sword with emotionally-moving language," this is not strictly true (111). Hal is, in fact, the most martially successful king of the second tetralogy (in fact, the most successful of all of Shakespeare's kings), but his rhetorical prowess is part and parcel of his military successes. Instead of replacing one with the other, then, Hal fuses the two; witness the way his Harfleur and St. Crispin's Day speeches inspire his men to victory in battle. (We might say that in a linguistic duel, his speech bests the Constable's own St. Crispin's Day speech.) This fusion and his copious style codes Hal as doubly-gendered, connecting him to Elizabeth, Richard, and Henry. But Hal's rhetorical skill is not solely used in service to the state; even at the height of Hal's martial prowess, he is still playing indulgent rhetorical games as in his "wanton and effeminate" days (*R2* 5.3.10). The glove sequence with Williams is nothing if not another tavern game, allowing Hal to keep one foot in its feminized, fertile world of "holiday and lady terms" (*1H4* 1.3.46).

---

[34] Adam Max Cohen similarly relates Hal's conduct to the new gender norms imported from Italy, noting that scenes of effeminization frame Hal's two scenes of great military exploits. See his "The Mirror of all Christian Courtiers: Castiglione's *Cortegiano* as a Source for *Henry V*," in *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & His Contemporaries*, ed. Michele Marrapodi (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007): 39-50, esp. 40-44.

This doubly-gendered Hal is also evident in his final scene with Katherine. He conflates her body with the territory of France, making his language an instrument of conquest in an attempt to stress its masculinity. But Hal's self-consciousness about his rhetorical prowess betrays him. In disavowing his ability to "look greenly," "gasp out [his] eloquence," and his "cunning in protestation," separating himself from the "fellows of infinite tongue, that can rhyme themselves into ladies' favors"—explicitly casting himself as a plain soldier and *not* a courtier—Hal in fact gives himself away as the latter (*H5* 5.2.143-44, 156-57). And he gives himself away at a moment when, if not for this reminder, the audience might not notice the way in which Hal himself deconstructs the soldier-courtier (masculine-feminine) binary. The copious insistence of his rhetoric begs the question of whom he is trying to convince in this scene, Katherine or himself. Again, as he draws attention to the performative nature of his wooing, he betrays his own anxieties, particularly in his determination to portray himself as a blunt, masculine soldier, a self-portrayal noticeably at odds with his reality. The scene at once vocalizes the concerns of the Elizabethan younger generation and attempts to soothe them; but through Hal's effeminate style, he becomes doubly-gendered instead of reassuringly masculine.

This perhaps also explains why Hal's masculinity is over-emphasized throughout the text as a whole. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, for example, observe that "the superior manliness of the English is so insisted upon that it comes to appear the main validation of their title: because they are more manly than the French, they are more fit to

rule anywhere."[35] That the effeminate Henry VI follows Hal, an observation that the final chorus pointedly makes, also undercuts the triumphant note of patriarchal authority the final scene attempts to sound. This is not to suggest that Hal is as effeminate as Henry VI, Henry IV, or Richard; nevertheless, his overdetermined masculinity suggests an attempted compensation for his feminine style.[36]

Several critics have seen shades of Elizabeth in Henry V (and *Henry V*). Annabel Patterson notes strong similarities between Hal's St. Crispin's Day speech and Elizabeth's at Tilbury (certainly Hal's use of political oratory in general suggests linguistic skill similar to Elizabeth's); Rackin argues that Henry V and Elizabeth are the best analogues for each other in the second tetralogy, as they both successfully negotiate similarly charged relationships with their nobles.[37] Rackin declares that "the king who most resembles Elizabeth as an image of benevolent royal authority is Henry V, and he is also the king who most bases his authority on women"—between his matrilineal claim to France's throne and his marriage to Katherine in an attempt to secure France—and that

---

35 Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, "History and Ideology, Masculinity and Miscegenation: The Instance of *Henry V*," in *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*, ed. Sinfield (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992): 109-42, 130.

36 In contrast, Parker argues that in the *Henriad*, *copia* is represented in the effeminate Falstaff, while Hal represents brevity, or at least "powerful control and mastery of tongues"; see her "On the Tongue: Cross-Gendering, Effeminacy, and the Art of Words," *Style* 23.3 (Fall 1989): 445-65, 453. However, Hal seems to have less than full mastery over French in the last scene of *Henry V*; and if, as Douglas Bruster has suggested, French is gendered as a feminine language, Hal's "mastery" of French might also effeminize him. See his "'In a Woman's Key': Women's Speech and Women's Language in Renaissance Drama," *Exemplaria* 4.2 (Fall 1992): 235-66, 261-62.

Elizabeth and Hal both represent "the transcendent ideal of perfect authority that eludes dramatic representation" (*Stages* 165, 164).[38] Dollimore and Sinfield point out that the internecine strife besetting Hal very much resembles that which beset Elizabeth (118-27); Peter C. Herman argues that the distance between Hal and his gilded reputation mirrors the distance between the mythos of Elizabeth and Elizabeth herself in the last decade of her reign.[39] The concern with reproduction that comes at the end of *Henry V* also reflects contemporary concerns over the succession and Elizabeth's lack of an heir. Rebecca Ann Bach, for example, has noted *Henry V*'s preoccupation with a generative masculinity, a preoccupation speaking to both Hal's desire to establish his own virility and late

---

[37] See Annabel Patterson, "Back by Popular Demand: The Two Versions of *Henry V*," *Renaissance Drama* 19 (1988): 29-62, 46, and Rackin, *Stages* 164-65.

[38] There is also attention drawn to Hal's Welsh origin in *Henry V*, an origin he shared with Elizabeth. Howard and Rackin argue that Wales serves as a feminine, dangerous locale (168-74).

Elizabethan culture's anxieties over their lack of an heir.[40] These similarities between Elizabeth and Hal are all highly suggestive. What critics have failed to address are the gendered implications of these similarities.

---

[39] Peter C. Herman, "'O, 'tis a gallant king': Shakespeare's *Henry V* and the Crisis of the 1590s," in *Tudor Political Culture*, ed. Dale Hoak (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995): 205-25.

[40] Rebecca Ann Bach, "Tennis Balls: *Henry V* and Testicular Masculinity, or, According to the *OED*, Shakespeare Doesn't Have Any Balls," *Renaissance Drama* 30 (1999-2001): 3-23. Other critics who have made this point include Dollimore and Sinfield, 130; Axton; and Richard Dutton, "'Methinks the Truth Should Live from Age to Age': The Dating and Contexts of *Henry V*," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005): 173-204. Succession is, of course, the mechanism by which patriarchy and masculinity are both upheld and threatened.

IV

Henry V was famously viewed as the "mirror of all Christian kings" in the early modern period, but we can see the basis of Hal's patriarchal power is his use of an effeminate rhetorical style, thus making him, like his father, an echo of the aging queen. In fact, we might even read Henry as encapsulating Elizabeth's weakness—her age, her infirmity—but Hal as her efficacy and strength. The implications of these echoes are wide-ranging, especially given Henry V's near-mythic status. Nina S. Levine argues that the *Henriad* "register[s] a skepticism not only toward representations of ruling women but also to the figure of the independent male monarch" that late Tudor England so desired, a skepticism enabled by Elizabeth's presence on the throne as a female monarch.[41] Certainly the refraction of Elizabeth in all of the tetralogy's kings points to the very impossibility of an absolute masculine/feminine binary, although early modern patriarchy attempted to argue for it. Even Hotspur, ostensibly the representative of the old chivalric masculinity, is chided for falling into a "woman's mood" with his uncontrollable rage against Henry (*1H4* 1.3.237). Nevertheless, that Richard, Henry, and

---

41 Nina S. Levine, *Women's Matters: Politics, Gender, and Nation in Shakespeare's Early History Plays* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 148. Levine covers the *Henriad* only in a brief epilogue; her study focuses on the first tetralogy and *King John*, and argues that Shakespeare "invite[s] a skepticism about representations of power…[and] call[s] into question the efficacy of patriarchal fictions of state power and national identity," undermining patriarchal history (15). Holderness makes a similar claim for *Richard II*, arguing that by marginalizing its women, the play "can be read as demonstrative of a deep-seated structural injustice in the way…society positions women," exposing the cost of patriarchal society's limitations on women. See Holderness, "'A Woman's War': A Feminist Reading of *Richard II*," in Kamps, ed.: 167-84, 180.

Hal all possess such specific Elizabethan echoes suggests more than merely that Shakespeare saw this binary as untenable.

Howard and Rackin's *Engendering a Nation*, which remains the only book-length feminist study of both tetralogies, argues that when taken in the order in which they were written, Shakespeare's histories increasingly marginalize their female characters, stripping them of authority and power. This process culminates in *Henry V*, which, they claim, paves the way for a more modern notion of masculinity and participates in the creation of the public and private spheres, with women banished to the private.[42] Just as Louis Montrose has examined *A Midsummer Night's Dream* through the lens of Simon Forman's erotic dream about Elizabeth, so we might be tempted to view the *Henriad* as

---

[42] Carol Banks attempts to redeem Shakespeare's portrayal of aristocratic women, noting the power of the women's words as well as their continued strength in the private realm, and argues that we should not mistake a paucity of lines for insignificance; see her "Warlike women: 'reproofe to these degenerate effeminate dayes'?" in Cavanagh, Hampton-Reeves, and Longstaffe, eds.: 169-81, 169. For Rackin's dissenting response to a draft version of this essay, see her "What Do You Do With a Woman Warrior?: A Response to 'Effeminate Dayes,'" *The Electronic Seminar: Early Modern Culture* 1 (2000), 1 March 2010 < http://emc.eserver.org/1-1/rackin.html >. Howard and Rackin do acknowledge masculine appropriation of the feminine in *Richard III*: "characterized throughout in terms of warlike masculinity and aggressive misogyny, Richard also commands the female power of erotic seduction…. Richard's monopoly of both male and female sexual energy is vividly portrayed in his seduction of Anne" (109). Katherine Eggert similarly emphasizes Richard's theatrical femininity and how it complicates his attempts at securing monarchical authority; see her *Showing Like a Queen: Female Authority and Literary Experiment in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 70-76, or N. Levine, 109-22. Rackin contends that Hal's project in *Henry V*, as well as his marriage to Katherine, "represents…the appropriation of the indispensable female ground of patriarchal authority" (*Stages* 168), while Eggert argues that Hal appropriates the feminine without being associated with it; but both refer only to Hal's appropriation of genealogical authority.

Essex' dream: the dream of a masculine, warlike state unencumbered by feminine caution or sensibilities.[43]

But what none of these critics have addressed are the generalized implications of the masculine appropriation of the feminine in the *Henriad*.[44] York and Suffolk's death scene, for instance, can be seen as turning the effeminate into the masculine; critics have long noted that, in a less overtly martial setting, their shared death might be coded as homoerotic or effeminate. But in context, in the homosocial world of the battlefield, it is held up as a paragon of chivalric brotherhood and masculinity (B. Smith 122-24).

We can see in the *Henriad* the return of the repressed; in this case, the repressed feminine.[45] There is no doubt that on one level, the *Henriad* serves as a particular cultural

---

43 Montrose, "'Shaping Fantasies': Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture," *Representations* 1.2 (Spring 1983): 61-94, 62-65.

44 In an argument closer to mine, David Landreth has claimed that Hal appropriates the linguistic work of the women of *Merry Wives* in order to master France; see his "Once More Into the Preech: The Merry Wives' English Pedagogy," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55.4 (Winter 2004): 420-49. Landreth references Walter Ong's "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite" (*Studies in Philology* 56.2 [April 1959]: 103-24), which argues that Latin instruction served as a rite of passage, moving boys from the female domestic sphere into the masculine public sphere. But if, as Marjorie Curry Woods has argued, an integral component of Latin education was composition in the female voice, we can see that appropriation of the feminine voice was an integral aspect of early modern boys' formative passage into manhood, a conclusion suggestive in its implications for early modern masculinity and its discontents. See her "Boys Will Be Women: Musings on Classroom Nostalgia and the Chaucerian Audience(s)," in *Speaking Images: Essays in Honor of V. A. Kolve*, ed. Robert F. Yeager and Charlotte C. Morse (Asheville, NC: Pegasus Press, 2001): 143-66.

45 There is a certain repression of the noble female in *1 Henry IV* and *Henry V*, especially when it comes to Hal and Henry. Henry's historical wife, Joan of Navarre, is barely mentioned; eliminated are Henry V's boyhood womanizing tendencies ("Passing the bounds of modesty, he was the fervent soldier of Venus as well as Mars; youthlike, he was fired with her torches," quoted in Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, *Henry V: The*

fantasy: a young, virile, masculine prince replaces his aged, effeminate father, complete with a seeming return to a martial masculinity, the sort of large-scale military action for which Elizabeth's male generals consistently agitated (and blamed her in gendered terms when she refused to act). But on a different level, that Richard, Henry, and Hal all possess effeminate characteristics and share various similarities with Elizabeth suggests the impossibility of ever truly banishing Elizabeth from these texts, despite a concerted patriarchal effort to do so. In fact, we can see Hal in particular as performing an Elizabethan action in appropriating characteristics of the opposite gender to reinforce his political authority. This return of this repressed feminine perhaps suggests that possession of some effeminate characteristics is necessary, or at least unavoidable, for Shakespeare's

---

Typical Mediaeval Hero [New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901], 86.); Hotspur disavows his love for Kate; and as Howard and Rackin note, Wales serves as a "site of a repression in the English historical narrative" through being linked to the feminine and the Welsh women's unspeakable atrocities (169-72). In *Henry V*, Dollimore and Sinfield observe that, while women "have little place in the history plays because the men there define themselves against other men…. [T]he men do this through constant reference to ideas of the feminine and the female…. [T]his exclusion of sexual disruption has to be repeated all through the play" (128-29). They also point to the play's inability to clearly state Henry's case for France as coming through the female line, and the excisions of women from genealogical matters in general throughout (129; contrast especially with 2.2 of *3 Henry VI*, where York's claim through the female line is stated clearly). That Katherine will become a matriarch of the Tudor dynasty through her second marriage similarly goes unmentioned; that she and Alice are linguistically isolated disempowers the threat of female speech. Repression of the feminine in patriarchal society, Adelman suggests, can be linked to fantasies of male parthenogenesis and by extension the fantasy of a son removed from and untainted by the effeminizing presence of the mother; but the impossibility of this fantasy—indeed, the very fact of its existence—gestures toward the central, unassailable place of the mother (*Mothers* 36 and *passim*). See also J. L. Simmons, "Masculine Negotiations in Shakespeare's History Plays: Hal, Hotspur, and 'the Foolish Mortimer,'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44.4 (Winter 1993): 440-63, and Erickson 62. N. Levine notes that at the end of *Richard III*, Richmond, or Henry Tudor, is similarly isolated from the feminine (117-20).

kings (having lived only under a female monarch, perhaps he found it hard to envision a completely masculine monarch), and maybe even early modern men in general. Useful here is Sylvia Federico's formulation concerning utopian texts:

> Utopian figures stand in for what has been repressed and replace the objectionable truth with something that is at once less distasteful but also thoroughly transparent in its motivation. Occupying a liminal space between complete repression and full consciousness, utopian figuration anticipates the truth and provides 'a way of taking cognizance of what is repressed' without having to acknowledge it fully.[46]

If we take *Henry V* as Essex' utopia, we can see that what is (imperfectly) repressed, the objectionable truth, is precisely Elizabeth and the feminine. Shakespeare's queenly kings also uncannily predict the rule of James I, who was criticized for being effeminate; in this sense, the *Henriad* is preemptively writing Elizabeth's history, anticipating the nostalgic cult of Elizabeth that arose under James even as it participates in the sixteenth-century cult of Henry V.

Whether this appropriation is at all positive is, of course, in the eye of the beholder.[47] It can evidence masculine reliance upon feminine power, or it can reveal masculine usurpation of feminine power; it can serve to question and undermine patriarchy, or it can uphold patriarchy. *Henry V*'s mockery of chivalry can be a rebuke to the Essex faction, or it can be a criticism of Elizabeth (or both, as these options are not

---

[46] Sylvia Federico, *New Troy: Fantasies of Empire in the Late Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), 74.

[47] Though not focused on drama, Elizabeth D. Harvey argues that early modern male appropriations of the female voice "fostered a vision that tended to reinforce women's silence or to marginalize their voices when they did speak or write"; see her *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts* (New York:

mutually exclusive; either way they point to fundamental flaws in Elizabeth's court and pave the way for later English political strife).[48] But the presence of this appropriation needs to be acknowledged, and its centrality to the politics of the play forces another acknowledgment, that the feminine has a role to play in early modern politics despite masculine claims of exclusion. Appearing in a commercial theater that threatened gender confusion as well as a nation in which men's political power rested on a woman, the doubly-gendered "mirror of all Christian kings" can become an alibi, a reassurance that effeminate attributes could in fact be positive characteristics (perhaps especially necessary for a theater-going public warned that they, too, would be "effeminated" by attending the theater, or even by their reliance upon their female monarch).[49] This reading shifts the *Henriad* away from plays such as *Troilus and Cressida*, terribly concerned with enacting masculinity, and toward plays such as *Twelfth Night* or *As You Like It*, with their playful gender fluidity. Unlike Lear's *hysterica passio* or Antony's inefficacy, Hal's effeminate characteristics are constructive and controlled; moreover, the overdetermined

---

Routledge, 1992), 5. However, such an appropriative process must be more complicated when it involves appropriating the voice of the female monarch.

48 Alexander Leggatt has argued that Hotspur's rhetoric is "unconsciously self-critical," speaking the death of chivalry, for "an honour that has to be fetched from the moon or the depths of the sea is an honour that is lost or at least remote, needing extravagant effort for its restoration." If so, an implicit criticism of Essex—and his definition of masculinity—is implied. See Leggatt, *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 85. See also Robin Headlam Wells, who argues that *Henry V* is a guarded criticism of the Essex faction's militancy in his *Shakespeare on Masculinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), ch. 1.

49 See for example Laura Levine, *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-Theatricality and Effeminization, 1579-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994). Levine quotes

masculinity that the texts present signals anxiety over its own threatened state even as it insists that the threats have been neutralized.

That critics have not taken note of this appropriation speaks to the encoding of our own desires in the text. We have the same desire as, perhaps, an early modern audience: to read a strong male ruler into the "mirror of all Christian kings," because that is the teleological narrative we feel we must follow, what we feel we should be seeing. Certainly our desire mirrors *Hal's* desire to be that figure. For example, that Hal is generally taken to have "won" in his wooing scene with Katherine reveals our investment in his success (a critical tendency particularly puzzling given that Hal and Katherine's scene replays elements from *The Taming of the Shrew*, a play whose critical history is deeply divided over the issue of gender relations). Karen Newman argues that Katherine's linguistic ineptitude becomes "a strategy of equivocation and deflection";[50] similarly, Dollimore and Sinfield note that Katherine's short answers can be played as cold and obstructive, not coy (138), Hal's attempts at wooing almost farcical. And yet their voices are in the minority; Hal is almost always interpreted as a successful seducer, despite his complaints to Burgundy that he "cannot so conjure up the spirit of love in her, that he will appear in his true likeness" (*H5* 5.2.288-90). I submit that this is so because the successful seducer is who we want him to be, because it fits our picture of what he should be. (Interestingly, Katherine seems more receptive to Hal's advances in the quarto

---

Stephen Gosson, who argues in *The School of Abuse* (1579) that the theater "'effeminated' the mind" (10).

50 Karen Newman, *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 107.

texts, yet the Folio text is the one more often cited as proving Hal's triumph.) If Goldberg argues that critics desire Hal as Falstaff does, what we see here is critics desiring what Hal desires; in effect, critics becoming Hal, his desires meshing with ours.

That critics have long overlooked the Elizabeth lurking in the heart of Prince Hal is also perhaps due to the gender of criticism, which has traditionally been a masculine preserve.[51] Critics are more comfortable with a teleological narrative in which Elizabeth has already been displaced by James (or Essex), rather than a narrative that undercuts its own sense of teleology in enacting the return of the feminine that the text tries to repress. Goldberg suggests that the exchange at the end of *Henry V* "intimates that phallic investment is not necessarily male, not even necessarily…in the hands of the sovereign but held by those who write his sovereignty and who, so doing, put themselves in his place" (158). When we as critics write Hal's sovereignty, we become invested in the same system. In a sense, then, Hal's dream is also Essex' dream—and ours, too. But it is false. That Elizabeth is at the heart of the *Henriad*—and not just in the figure of the deposed Richard II—demonstrates just how disruptive Elizabeth was not only to early

---

51 See for example Lynda E. Boose, "The Family in Shakespeare Studies; or—Studies in the Family of Shakespeareans; or—the Politics of Politics," *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.4 (Winter 1987): 707-42; Alan D. Lewis, "Shakespearean Seductions, or, What's With Harold Bloom as Falstaff?" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 49.2 (Summer 2007): 125-54; and Goldberg, ch. 5. By suggesting that criticism is gendered masculine, I do not mean to suggest that it is a mode of thought restricted to male critics. Eggert, for example, claims that "Shakespeare's histories enter into…debate regarding how to construct a masculine literary form out of literary history" while Elizabeth sat on the throne, and posits *Henry V* as a triumph of patriarchy over precarious female rule (55). For a longer explication of criticism as gendered, see Rackin, *Shakespeare and Women* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), ch. 1 and 66-71.

modern patriarchy, but also to our view of that patriarchy, even and especially in the texts we read as excluding her.

In *Suffocating Mothers*, Janet Adelman traces male characters' reactions to powerful, threatening female characters in Shakespearean drama. She notes that after *Richard III* but before *Hamlet*, "mothers virtually disappear…. [M]asculine identity is constructed in and through absence of the maternal" (10).[52] But if we take Elizabeth as hovering over the *Henriad*, nowhere precisely because she is everywhere, she then becomes a disembodied but powerful maternal threat to the culture's manhood, and thus what needs to be repressed and disarmed. Adelman argues that in Shakespeare's late works, female characters suffer and die for arousing masculine anxiety over their potentially effeminizing presence. For the *Henriad*, however, I wish to posit an alternate paradigm for management of the anxiety caused by this threatening cultural mother: one in which male protagonists absorb female characteristics in order to defuse and appropriate the power of the disembodied mother, Elizabeth herself, although in so doing they inevitably "resurrect" her. Women thus do not have a small role in the second tetralogy solely because it offers the (impossible) fantasy of history as a masculine preserve; they do not appear in person because they are too threatening, and because they are always already there (especially if the *Henriad* is read as the tetralogy in which Shakespeare's histories transition into the "modern" Elizabethan world). It is certainly true that plays between *Richard III* and *Hamlet*, plays written during Elizabeth's final

years, generally lack mothers (in and of itself suggestive of sentiment toward Elizabeth), but this does not mean they lack the maternal. Dollimore and Sinfield argue that the feminine is "incorporated after being represented as inherently submissive," but why would men be interested in incorporating submissive weakness (128)? On the contrary, not only does this male appropriation serve to confirm both female power and men's reliance on it, but also the impossibility of men ever fully absorbing or neutralizing this female power. In this light, male effeminacy becomes a positive characteristic. Unable to depict an aging Elizabeth in armor à la Margaret, but with Elizabeth alive also unable to fully excoriate the threatening maternal in the same manner as Shakespeare's later plays, the *Henriad* found a different way of managing the anxieties that Elizabeth aroused.

This strategy was not limited to the *Henriad*, either. Julius Caesar, for example, relishes the thought that "from [him] great Rome shall suck" (*Julius Caesar* 2.2.87). Adelman elsewhere argues that part of Antony's mythological and tragic stature derives from his effeminate embracing of Egypt and its excesses (Parker's *copia*), and that the younger Roman generation is weakened by its rejection of such excess; Suzanne Penuel argues for a maternal Prospero as tied to Jacobean fantasies of authority.[53] In both cases,

---

52 It is only after Elizabeth's death that these powerful maternal figures return to the stage. See Leonard Tennenhouse, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres* (New York: Methuen, 1986).

53 Adelman, *The Common Liar: An Essay on* Antony and Cleopatra (New Haven: Yale UP, 1973), esp. 132-45; Suzanne Penuel, "Male Mothering in *The Tempest*," in *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*, ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007): 115-27. A connection can be drawn between Henry V's mythic stature and Hal's excess, as well as Falstaff's excess, which has made him legendary in critical circles.

male effeminacy contains positive elements. Adelman also identifies Timon with fantasies of maternal bounty (*Mothers* ch. 7), while Lear's *hysterica passio* has already been remarked upon. Though less positive, these characters are still appropriating feminine qualities in the absence of the mother. When taken together it becomes clear that in Shakespearean drama, this appropriative strategy is wide-ranging and becomes a paradigm complementary to the punishment of women that Adelman outlines, as male characters seize (Elizabeth's) authority to punish, and a paradigm that should be investigated for its effects on the drama. That this appropriation seems to be concentrated in the Shakespearean canon around Elizabeth's decline and after her death is surely no accident, enabled by Elizabeth's weakness but also serving to keep her alive.

Particularly, the *Henriad* returns to what psychoanalytic studies of Shakespeare posit as the core of masculine anxiety—the dependence of men upon women to perpetuate patriarchal authority even as the women threaten it (Kahn 12-17, Montrose, *Purpose* 125)—and attempts to destroy the threat and attendant anxiety of said dependence by removing women themselves, enacting the fantasy of a safe, unthreatening return to the womb. Appropriating female characteristics thus becomes an attempt to efface the originary threat to patriarchy altogether, taking the recuperative banishment of Adelman's mothers one step further. But, of course, such an attempt is always futile, not least because Elizabeth as the central mother figure of early modern culture is impossible to erase. This attempt also uncannily anticipates James' reign if, as Penuel has claimed, "Stuart repaternalization…often took a distinctly transgendered

form, one admitting of female influence," even as James disavowed (in the psychoanalytic sense of the term) Elizabeth's womanly rule (115-16).[54]

As an example of the ways in which recognizing this appropriation can change our thinking about certain plays, in the *Henriad* the appropriation of Elizabeth has the paradoxical effect of protecting her. For Montrose, who views Elizabeth as extremely influential in shaping early modern culture, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* points to the reciprocal power that the English populace possessed to figure Elizabeth in turn. The *Henriad*, however, disputes this popular power. Montrose argues that *A Midsummer Night's Dream* contests "a princely claim to cultural generativity and social authority" by opening the possibility of undermining the forms of power to which it ostensibly pays tribute (*Purpose* 204). But in the *Henriad*, the undermining force is Elizabeth's authority; and in the tetralogy we can see that what appears to be a contestation of Elizabeth's authority becomes a reification of it. In the subplot of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*,

> a fantasy of masculine dependency upon women is expressed and contained within a fantasy of masculine control over women…effectively suppress[ing] the anomalous relationship between gender and power that is incarnated in Shakespeare's sovereign. It is in this sense that the structure of Shakespeare's comedy may be said to neutralize symbolically the gendered forms of royal power to which it ostensibly pays homage. (Montrose, *Purpose* 203)

But unlike *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the *Henriad* forecloses the possibility of "taming" the Elizabeth figure specifically by not representing her (Shakespeare even changed the name of Hotspur's wife to Kate, as the historical Lady Percy was named

---

54 For example, in *Basilikon Doron* James I counsels his son to be a loving "nourish-father," offering "nourish-milke"; quoted in *The Political Works of James I*, ed. C. H. McIlwain (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1918), 24.

Elizabeth). In likening the *Henriad*'s kings to Elizabeth, the *Henriad* makes Elizabeth herself unassailable even as it tries to completely exclude her. For Montrose, male characters appropriate feminine power in the service of containing women; in the *Henriad*, this appropriation is key to political power in general, and opens the men to effeminacy. Thus we can see again the *Henriad* reifying Elizabeth even as it ostensibly works to exclude her in a reversal of the generally accepted gender politics of Shakespeare's genres: the history plays in a sense affirm feminine agency, while the comedy circumscribes female power, and not just in marriage.

The continued dependence of Shakespeare's kings on the female line—and that, more generally, all of Shakespeare's kings tend to be queenly—also serves to indicate Elizabeth's centrality to her state, the ways in which, despite all fantasies to the contrary, it could never truly conceive of a world without her. Dollimore and Sinfield note that in *Henry V*, "banishment of the feminine and the female, even as these are conceived of by the masculine and the patriarchal, cannot be easily achieved" (129). But perhaps we might see the banishment of the female as contingent upon the absorption of the feminine/effeminate, and therefore not truly banishment at all, perhaps even a gesture toward a fantasy of a renewed Elizabeth, not her demise. Male characters and courtiers, appropriating Elizabeth and the feminine, find that they are in turn appropriated by the effeminate, unable to escape it, a reversal (and repetition, perhaps indicating an inability to imagine a future without Elizabeth) of Elizabeth's own appropriation of the masculine. That the history plays (and perhaps even the tragedies) as a genre allow for—in fact, insist upon—this doubly-gendered representation of male monarchs, even as they

foreground female characters such as Margaret of Anjou, indicates the deep gender confusion the patriarchal system found itself in during late Elizabethan England, unable to banish women to the domestic sphere. Chivalry, Hotspur's code, was becoming "an object of nostalgia . . . appropriate to an outworn code of masculinity that belonged to Chaucer's time, not King James's" (B. Smith 48). Nostalgia, of course, is the desire for desire itself; it is the desire for something that never existed in the first place, which by definition is impossible to attain.[55] In its unconscious maneuvers, the *Henriad* marks the recognition that women can never be excluded from the public; but this recognition handled in a different manner than Adelman's murdered mothers. Instead, the male protagonists appropriate feminine characteristics, and circulate them back into the political sphere. That the *Henriad* is so deeply implicated in such a circulation should not surprise us. We should not forget, after all, that through Falstaff and his compatriots the *Henriad* is connected to *The Merry Wives of Windsor*—perhaps the Shakespeare play in which the male protagonist is most like a woman, the setting most contemporary, and the women most dominant.

---

55 Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Durham: Duke UP, 1993), 23.

Bibliography

Primary Sources-Shakespeare

King Henry IV Part 1. Ed. David Scott Kastan. London: Thomson Learning, 2002.

King Richard II. Ed. Charles Forker. London: Thomson Learning, 2002.

The Norton Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.

The Riverside Shakespeare. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans et al. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.

Primary Sources-Other

Elizabeth I. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Elizabeth I*. 1823. Ed. John Nichols. 3 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1968.

---. *The Public Speaking of Queen Elizabeth I*. Ed George P. Rice. New York: Columbia UP, 1951.

Holinshed, Raphael. *Shakespeare's Holinshed: An Edition of Holinshed's* Chronicles *(1587)*. Ed. Richard Hosley. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

James I. *The Political Works of James I*. Ed. C. H. McIlwain. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1918.

Nashe, Thomas. *Pierce Penniless his Supplication to the Devil*. *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*. Ed. J. B. Steane. New York: Penguin, 1972. 49-145.

Secondary Sources

Abrams, Richard. "Rumor's Reign in *2 Henry IV*: The Scope of a Personification." *English Literary Renaissance* 16.3 (September 1986): 467-95.

Adelman, Janet. *The Common Liar: An Essay on* Antony and Cleopatra. New Haven: Yale UP, 1973.

---. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays,* Hamlet *to* The Tempest. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Axton, Marie. *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1977.

Bach, Rebecca Ann. "Tennis Balls: *Henry V* and Testicular Masculinity, or, According to the OED, Shakespeare Doesn't Have Any Balls." *Renaissance Drama* 30 (1999-2001): 3-23.

Banks, Carol. "Warlike women: 'reproofe to these degenerate effeminate dayes'?" Cavanagh, Hampton-Reeves, and Longstaffe 169-81.

Barroll, Leeds. "A New History for Shakespeare and His Time." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39.4 (Winter 1988): 441-64.

Boose, Lynda E. "The Family in Shakespeare Studies; or—Studies in the Family of Shakespeareans; or—the Politics of Politics." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.4 (Winter 1987): 707-42.

Breitenberg, Mark. *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Bruster, Douglas. "'In a Woman's Key': Women's Speech and Women's Language in Renaissance Drama." *Exemplaria* 4.2 (Fall 1992): 235-66.

Campbell, Lily B. *Shakespeare's Histories: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy*. San Marino, CA: The Huntington Library, 1947.

Cavanagh, Dermont, Stuart Hampton-Reeves, and Stephen Longstaffe, eds. *Shakespeare's Histories and Counter-Histories*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006.

Cohen, Adam Max. "The Mirror of all Christian Courtiers: Castiglione's *Cortegiano* as a Source for *Henry V*." *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & His Contemporaries*. Ed. Michele Marrapodi. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. 39-50.

Corum, Richard. "Henry's Desires." Fradenburg and Freccero 71-97.

Crunelle-Vanrigh, Anny. "*Henry V* as a Royal Entry." *SEL* 47.2 (Spring 2007): 355-77.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield. "History and Ideology, Masculinity and Miscegenation: The Instance of *Henry V*." *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the*

Politics of Dissident Reading. Ed. Sinfield. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992. 109-42.

Dutton, Richard. "'Methinks the Truth Should Live from Age to Age': The Dating and Contexts of *Henry V*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.1/2 (2005): 173-204.

Eggert, Katherine. *Showing Like a Queen: Female Authority and Literary Experiment in Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Enterline, Lynn. *The Tears of Narcissus: Melancholia and Masculinity in Early Modern Writing*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.

Erickson, Peter. *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Esler, Anthony. *The Aspiring Mind of the Elizabethan Younger Generation*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1966.

Federico, Sylvia. *New Troy: Fantasies of Empire in the Late Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Fradenburg, Louise and Carla Freccero. *Premodern Sexualities*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Frye, Susan. *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

---. "The Myth of Elizabeth at Tilbury." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 23.1 (Spring 1992): 95-114.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992.

Halpern, Richard. *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.

Hammer, Paul E. J. "Shakespeare's *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.1 (Spring 2008): 1-35.

Harvey, Elizabeth D. *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Herman, Peter C. "'O, 'tis a gallant king': Shakespeare's *Henry V* and the Crisis of the 1590s." *Tudor Political Culture*. Ed. Dale Hoak. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 205-25.

Holderness, Graham. *Shakespeare: The Histories*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000.

---. "'A Woman's War': A Feminist Reading of *Richard II*." Kamps 167-84.

Howard, Jean E. and Phyllis Rackin. *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Kahn, Coppélia. *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Kamps, Ivo, ed. *Shakespeare Left and Right*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Kastan, David Scott. "'The King Hath Many Marching in His Coats,' or, What Did You Do in the War, Daddy?" Kamps 241-58.

Kingsford, Charles Lethbridge. *Henry V: The Typical Mediaeval Hero*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.

Kuchta, David. "The Semiotics of Masculinity in Renaissance England." *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe: Institutions, Texts, Images*. Ed. James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 233-46.

Landreth, David. "Once More Into the Preech: The Merry Wives' English Pedagogy." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55.4 (Winter 2004): 420-49.

Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Levin, Carole. *"The Heart and Stomach of a King": Elizabeth I and the Politics of Sex and Power*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

Levine, Laura. *Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-Theatricality and Effeminization, 1579-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Levine, Nina S. *Women's Matters: Politics, Gender, and Nation in Shakespeare's Early History Plays*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998.

Lewis, Alan D. "Shakespearean Seductions, or, What's With Harold Bloom as Falstaff?" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 49.2 (Summer 2007): 125-54.

Low, Jennifer. *Manhood and the Duel: Masculinity in Early Modern Drama and Culture*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.

Mallin, Eric. *Inscribing the Time: Shakespeare and the End of Elizabethan England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Marcus, Leah S. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and Its Discontents*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

McGee, C. E. "*2 Henry IV*: The Last Tudor Royal Entry." *Mirror up to Shakespeare: Essays in Honour of G. R. Hibbard*. Ed. J. C. Gray. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984. 149-58.

Montrose, Louis A. *The Purpose of Playing: Shakespeare and the Cultural Politics of the Elizabethan Theatre*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

---. "'Shaping Fantasies': Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture." *Representations* 1.2 (Spring 1983): 61-94.

---. *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Newman, Karen. *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Ong, Walter. "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite." *Studies in Philology* 56.2 (April 1959): 103-24.

Parker, Patricia. *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, Property*. New York: Methuen, 1985.

---. "On the Tongue: Cross-Gendering, Effeminacy, and the Art of Words." *Style* 23.3 (Fall 1989): 445-65.

---. "Virile Style." Fradenburg and Freccero 199-222.

Paster, Gail Kern. *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.

---. *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Patterson, Annabel. "Back by Popular Demand: The Two Versions of *Henry V*." *Renaissance Drama* 19 (1988): 29-62.

Penuel, Suzanne. "Male Mothering in *The Tempest*." *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England*. Ed. Kathryn M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. 115-27.

Pollard, A. W., et al, eds. *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland, and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. London: The Bibliographic Society, 1976.

Rackin, Phyllis. *Shakespeare and Women*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.

---. *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

---. "What Do You Do With a Woman Warrior?: A Response to 'Effeminate Dayes.'" *The Electronic Seminar: Early Modern Culture* 1 (2000): n. pag. Web. 1 March 2010. < http://emc.eserver.org/1-1/rackin.html >.

Rebhorn, Wayne A. "The Crisis of the Aristocracy in *Julius Caesar*." *Renaissance Quarterly* 43.1 (Spring 1990): 75-111.

---. *The Emperor of Men's Minds: Literature and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.

Simmons, J. L. "Masculine Negotiations in Shakespeare's History Plays: Hal, Hotspur, and 'the Foolish Mortimer.'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44.4 (Winter 1993): 440-63.

Smith, Bruce R. *Shakespeare and Masculinity*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Smith, Lacey Baldwin. *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.

Stewart, Susan. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.

Tennenhouse. Leonard. *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres*. New York: Methuen, 1986.

Thorne, Alison. "There is a history in all men's lives: reinventing history in *2 Henry IV*." Cavanagh, Hampton-Reeves, and Longstaffe 49-66.

Traub, Valerie. *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Vaught, Jennifer C. *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008.

Wells, Robin Headlam. *Shakespeare on Masculinity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Woods, Marjorie Curry. "Boys Will Be Women: Musings on Classroom Nostalgia and the Chaucerian Audience(s)." *Speaking Images: Essays in Honor of V. A. Kolve*. Ed. Robert F. Yeager and Charlotte C. Morse. Asheville, NC: Pegasus Press, 2001. 143-66.

Vita

Meghan Cordula Andrews was born in 1986 in Springfield, Massachusetts, to Stephen M. and Cathy Cunningham Andrews of Longmeadow, Mass. After attending Longmeadow High School, she graduated in 2004 and matriculated at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island. She graduated from Brown in May of 2008 with an A.B. in English and Religious Studies and enrolled in the Graduate School of the University of Texas at Austin in August of 2008. She has a younger sister, Sydney Elaine.

Email: Meghan_Andrews@mail.utexas.edu

This report was typed by the author.